Remarks

In the present response, claims 1-20 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 102(a) and 103(a)

Claims 1-8 and 14-20 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(a) as being anticipated by US publication number 2002/0194000 (Bennett). Claims 9-13 and 20 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bennett. These rejections are traversed.

The independent claims recite numerous recitations that are not taught or suggested in Bennett. By way of example, the claim1 recites:

> receiving ground truths with correct text for the different speech utterances;
> processing the different speech utterances at different ASR engines;
> comparing output from each of the different ASR engines with the ground truths to determine ranks of the different ASR engines for accuracy in recognizing the different speech utterances;

First, Bennett does not compare output from each of the different ASR engines with the ground truths to determine ranks. In Bennett, "recognizers return their converted speech accompanied by one or more values that indicates the confidence the recognizer has in a particular result" (see Bennett at paragraph [0022]). Thus the engines themselves in Bennett return confidences.

For at least these reasons, the claims are allowable over Bennett.

Second, the claim recites that the outputs from the different ASR engines are compared with "ground truths" to determine ranks. This comparison is not made in Bennett. Bennett uses a predictor that "tracks performance over time to improve the enabling and selection process" (see Bennett at paragraphs [0025]). Bennett also gathers feedback but does not teach or suggest that ranks are determined based on a comparison with ground truths.

For at least these reasons, the claims are allowable over Bennett.

Third, the claim recites "assigning a different ASR engine to each category based on the ranks of the ASR engines." Bennett does not teach or suggest this element. Bennett states that the "system may be configured so that it enables only a single recognizer ..." or "the system may enable all recognizers ..." (see Bennett at paragraph [0021]. Nowhere does Bennett suggest that the recognizers are enabled based on "ranks" of the recognizers.

For at least these reasons, the claims are allowable over Bennett.

Fourth, the claim recites that ranks of different ASR engines are determined for different speech utterances. Bennett does not rank different recognizers for different speech utterances. In Bennett, the "predictor selects the best result based on the information available to it..." (see Bennett at paragraph [0025]). The recognizers, though, are not ranked for different speech utterances.

For at least these reasons, the claims are allowable over Bennett.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above. Applicants believe that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to Philip S. Lyren at Telephone No. 832-236-5529. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted.

/Philip S. Lyren #40,709/

Philip S. Lyren
Reg. No. 40,709
Ph: 832-236-5529